

\_\_\_\_\_

friend on the ground. Suffice it to say that upon his arrival in Louisville, some months ago, Lowe crowded him, to which he very quietly submitted, knowing full well that he was in the wrong.

That women were afraid to let their children pass Lowe's door for fear of a random shot, we utterly deny. That one family, the head of which had been disgraced by Lowe, said such things, is quite probable. But, that it was the truth, no one will for a moment intend. In regard to the assertion that Lowe died regretted in his community, we have to say, that a more stupendous lie never appeared in print, and could only have been uttered by a miserable craven, who feared Lowe during life, and hates him in death. The reasons that the community have for not avenging his death, are identical with those of Louisville for not avenging the outrages of Bloody Monday.

[For the Louisville Courier.]

### Protection of Slavery in the Territories—Vindication of the Views of the Kentucky Age.

*Editors Louisville Courier:* In the Cincinnati Enquirer of Wednesday, the 15th inst., there appeared a brief statement of the position of the Kentucky Age on the subject of Congressional protection to slavery in the Territories of the United States. The views of the Kentucky Age on that subject are in my opinion correct, and embody the sentiments of those Southern and Northern Democrats, who maintain that Congress has the right, and that it is its duty, in certain contingencies, to intervene in the Territories to protect slave property. It is believed that when this view is fully presented, and clearly understood, that it will address itself strongly to the intelligence, patriotism and sense of justice of the Democracy of the entire North, and that so far from being considered at all obnoxious, it will be at once recognized by them as the only correct and constitutional solution of the question of slavery in the Territories.

The propositions in the article in the Age are, in my opinion, plain, simple and unanswerable—in a word, self-evident. Indeed, I very much regret that the Enquirer did not publish its views and let them speak for themselves, rather than state the position in such a manner as, unintentionally no doubt, to do it injustice. The objections to the principle of intervention for protection are attributable more to a confused idea of the proposition than an actual opposition to it.

When this question is thoroughly discussed it will receive the cordial approval of the people of the South without distinction of party, and in my opinion, to make a national test of Democratic orthodoxy, and I regret that any paper in the South, or any Democratic paper anywhere opposes intervention to protect slavery in the Territories—I regret it because in a few months at furthest, they will be compelled to explain away their present heretical opinions.

In its reply to the article of the Age the Enquirer, announces the startling fact that "the Democracy of the Free States do not and never did believe that slavery exists in the Territories under the Constitution of the United States." It is right that the Enquirer should be thus explicit. The question must be met fairly and squarely, and if this be the position of the Northern Democracy, it is well that the South should know it. But we, of the South, are unwilling to believe that the Enquirer is the exponent of sound Northern Democratic sentiment on this subject and there is scarcely a doubt that its position will be promptly condemned and repudiated by every Constitutional Democrat in the land. It is and always has been the boast of the National Democracy that they are and always have been a Constitutional party. The Democracy of the North have defended and upheld the rights of the people of the South, not because they entertained any peculiar affection for slavery, but because the right to hold slaves was guaranteed by the Constitution. They have always been willing to maintain our Constitutional rights; and now if they are unwilling to stand where they have always stood for fear of being unable to carry a single Northern State in the approaching Presidential election, there is then certainly a marked and significant demoralization and degeneracy in Northern Democratic sentiment. Are the Northern Democracy still willing to stand by the Constitution and its guarantees? are they willing to plant themselves on its compromises, and follow the Constitution wherever it leads? If so, then we have a common platform on which all true Democrats North and South may unite, if not any union of our party is merely the result of an intense desire to hold the offices and wield the patronage of the General Government.

Notwithstanding the views of the Enquirer, I believe the Democracy of the North will recognize the Constitution as the supreme law of the land, and will maintain it though it "manacles every slave in the South." The history of the Northern Democracy fully warrants this declaration. Their sacrifices and efforts against the inhuman spirit of Abolitionism is an earnest of what may be expected from them in the future. They have contended for principle and not merely for power—and this should always be with them the controlling incentive to action; and when the Democratic party shall be so demoralized as to engage in a mere scramble for office, and wholly ignores its distinctive principles to secure success, then the Democracy is reduced to the pitiable level of all the other miserable parties of the day, whose acknowledged bond of union is the cohesive power of public plunder.

But is the position of the Enquirer constitutional, or is it in direct antagonism to a fair and proper interpretation of that instrument? The question of the existence of slavery in the Territories, under the Constitution of the United States, has been thoroughly and ably discussed before the Supreme Court—it has been adjudicated upon, and the opinion of that high tribunal, as rendered in the Dred Scott case, is that "slavery exists in the Territories under the Constitution of the United States." Whether the Enquirer assents to this opinion or objects to it, is a matter of very little consequence. Certain it is that it is an opinion which will last so long as our confederacy lasts, and which is and will be recognized by every true Constitutional Democrat, both in the South and North. The Democracy of the North cannot and will not join the Enquirer in any crusade against the opinion of the Supreme Court, when they are fully convinced that that opinion is clear, perspicuous, unanswerable, and equal and just in all its operations. In order that the opinions of the Enquirer and the Age may be clearly understood, I will reproduce them side by side, and then leave to the reader to determine which occupies the stronger position.

#### POSITION OF THE "KENTUCKY AGE."

"We hold that slavery exists in the Territories under the constitution of the United States, and that in such Territories the right of the slaveholder to the protection of his slave property is clear and indisputable, and that any action of a Territorial Legislature having a tendency to weaken or impair this right, either by unfriendly legislation or otherwise, is manifestly violative of the Federal Constitution."

"Should a Territorial Legislature fail to pass laws to protect slave property or laws adverse thereto, then Congress should intervene, not to establish slavery, but to protect each and every citizen of the Territories in the enjoyment of his constitutional rights."

#### THE POSITION OF THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER.

"The Democracy of the Free States do not and never did believe that slavery exists in the Territories under the Constitution of the United States. They believe it is an exclusive State institution, depending on local laws for its support. The Democracy are willing that slavery shall go into all the Territories when the people want it but they will never consent that it shall be forced upon them by Congress, whether they decide it or not."

The positions of the Enquirer and Age are distinct, and stand out in direct antagonism the one to the other. Under these circumstances it would be well to appeal to the highest judicial tribunal of the land, and leave the question to it for a final decision. We submit the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case. Every one can see that it fully and completely sustains the position of the Age, and it is directly opposed to the obnoxious and untenable doctrines of the Enquirer:

#### OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

"The Territory was acquired by the General Government as the representative and trustee of the people of the United States, and it must, therefore, be held in that character for their common and equal rights."

"The Territory being a part of the U. States, the Government and the citizens both enter it under the authority of the Constitution, with their respective rights defined and marked out."

"No word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress a greater power over slave property, or which entitles property of that kind to less protection than property of any other description. The only power conferred is the power coupled with the duty of GUARDING AND PROTECTING THE OWNER IN HIS RIGHTS."

"Upon these considerations it is the opinion of the Court that the act of Congress, which prohibited a citizens from holding and owning property of this kind in the Territory of the United States, etc., is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void."

I might make numerous citations from the writings of distinguished and prominent Northern Democrats to show that they heartily approve the opinion of the Supreme Court, and regard the position of the Enquirer as one pregnant with error. I will, however, make another quotation, which, of itself, is enough to impale completely the editor of the Enquirer. It is an extract from Mr. Buchanan's letter to Prof. Sillman. It may be that the Enquirer endorsed this letter when it originally appeared:

#### OPINION OF MR. BUCHANAN.

"Slavery existed at that period, [the time of the passage of the Nebraska-Kansas bill] and still exists in Kansas, under the Constitution of the United States. This point has at last been decided by the highest tribunals known to our laws. How it could ever have been doubted is a mystery."

But fearful that neither the opinion of the Supreme Court nor of Mr. Buchanan will avail anything with the editor of the Enquirer, I will quote a passage from the Nebraska Kansas act, prepared by Mr. Douglas, which is a clear recognition of the Constitutional existence of slavery:

"In all cases involving title to slaves, the said writs of error or appeals shall be allowed and decided by the said Supreme Court, without regard to the value of the matter, property or title in controversy."

This is a virtual acknowledgment of the right of property in slaves in the Territories under the Constitution; for it would be supreme folly to establish a tribunal to determine title to slaves, if the right to hold them did not exist.

Indeed it is a matter of surprise that any person should doubt for a single moment, the existence of this right in its fullest and most unrestricted extent. If the right to slave property in the Territories does not exist under the Constitution, it can have no legal existence whatever. Congress is but the creature of the Constitution; the Territorial Legislature is merely the agent of Congress, and its action is limited and restricted to its delegated powers. So Congress is only the trustee of the States, and holds the Territories as trustee for the common benefit of all the States, and it is certainly very clear that any discrimination against slavery either by Congress or the Territorial Legislature, would be a manifest betrayal of trust. Congress has neither the power to abolish or impair the right in slave property, but possesses the power coupled with the duty to grant and protect it. So says the Supreme Court, and the South is willing to abide by and uphold its decision.

There is a manifest difference between intervention to protect, and intervention to abolish or destroy property. The Cincinnati platform proclaims the doctrine of non-intervention with the institution of slavery in the States, Territories, and in the District of Columbia; but this non-intervention was most certainly not intended to preclude the idea of protection of slave property.

It proclaimed the idea of non-intervention in the District of Columbia; but still Congress protects slavery there. So, also, in regard to the States. It was never meant to prevent the protection of slave property, by the enactment of the fugitive slave law. The principle involved in the protection of slave property by the fugitive slave law and by laws protecting slavery in the District of Columbia, involves precisely the same principle as the protection of slavery in the Territories.

It will not do to say that the Supreme Court in the final arbiter of this question. The failure of the Territorial Legislature to pass protective laws, cannot be reached by the Supreme Court. True, we would possess the constitutional right to hold slave property there, but we would not possess the power to hold it without protective laws. The Fugitive Slave law presents a similar case. Under the Federal Constitution, we possess the right to reclaim fugitives from labor, but that right is nothing without the passage of a law to carry it out. And it would certainly be exceedingly difficult for the Supreme Court to provide a remedy for the failure of Congress to pass a fugitive slave law, but not more difficult than it would be for the Supreme Court to provide a remedy for a failure of the Territorial Legislature to pass laws protecting the rights of slave holders.

But it is needless to multiply citations or arguments. The point is clear, and we are greatly surprised that the Enquirer should have been misled into advancing arguments so untenable and absurd. To sum up the matter: the position of the Enquirer is in contradiction to the opinion of the Supreme Court, at war even with the sentiments of Northern Democrats, is in antagonism to the Nebraska-Kansas act, and is not sustained by any rational deductions of sound reason. On the contrary, the position of the Age is in harmony with the opinion of the Supreme Court, the sentiments of the President, and the view of true Northern Democrats, the principles of the Nebraska-Kansas act, and sustained by every consideration of constitutional right and equity, as well as by plain, simple, and unanswerable argument.

The views of the Enquirer I consider radically wrong—worse, if possible, than Wilmot Provisoism. The position it assumes involves a manifest and palpable absurdity. It holds that the creature is greater than the creator; and whilst denying the right of Congress to legislate on slavery, concedes that right to the Territorial legislature—the mere agent of Congress. It holds that the Territorial legislature, deriving all its powers from Congress, may legitimately do what Congress may not do. The South is equally as safe with Congress as with the Territorial squatters, and when it is agreed at the Territorial legislature may cripple or abolish slavery, then we are powerless in the Territories of the Union.

But the editor of the Enquirer assails the doctrine of intervention to protect slavery, and in allusion to the article in the Age, facetiously remarks "that the editor of the Age ought to have political sense enough to know that Congressional aid for slavery in the Territories can never be obtained." If there be any special or overwhelming argument in this declaration of the Enquirer, I frankly confess, I have been wholly unable to discover it. Now, if it means that after it shall have been clearly demonstrated that Congressional protection is right and Constitutional, and its exercise obligatory on Congress, still the North, having the majority will refuse to regard, recognize or carry out the provisions of the Federal Constitution, and the rights it secures, then its position is clearly understood. The South will know how to act in such contingency. When our constitutional rights are laughed at and ignored, the North will find that the South acknowledges no union with States which disregard and trample on the Federal Constitution.

CYNTHIANA, Ky., March 21, 1859.

### LETTER FROM HARRODSBURG.

[Correspondence of the Louisville Courier.]

Not a holy sacrifice of A. E. Gibbons, Esq., Editor of the Harrodsburg Transcript.

HARRODSBURG, Ky., April 12, 1859.

*Editors Louisville Courier:* A gloom overspreads our town. This afternoon, about three o'clock, A. E. Gibbons, Esq., shot himself through the head, on the grounds of the United States Military Asylum, located in this place. He was found, shortly after, by a man passing through the grounds, but was not alive. The alarm was given, several persons soon reached the spot, and upon being asked who did it, his response was, "King Alcohol." A few minutes before he was found, he was in conversation with Sargeant Devitt, who has charge of the Asylum, and the remarks he made to Devitt leave no ground for belief that any one but himself committed the deed, although they did not create a suspicion at the time. It is now six o'clock, and, strange to say, he still lives, though the ball penetrated his brain, and passed almost entirely through his head. Attending physicians think it impossible for him to live through the night. Those who are somewhat acquainted with his financial matters, express the opinion that pecuniary embarrassment caused him to put an end to his existence. He was a member of the Baptist Church. He leaves a wife and six youthful children upon the cold charities of the world. Yours, in haste, DOUBLEYOU.

### Democratic Meeting in Trimble.

At a meeting of the Democrats of Trimble at the Court House in Madison, on the 11th inst., it being County Court day, M. T. Abbott, Esq., was called to the chair.

After the objects of the meeting were stated, the Committee on Resolutions, consisting of N. Parker, Wm. Gatewood, S. Gatewood, Richard Bell and Wm. O. Ellis, reported the following:

WHEREAS, It is a time-honored custom of the Democracy to meet frequently and express their views on the political topics of the day, as well as to nominate their candidates for the several offices, &c., therefore, be it resolved,

1. That we concur with our Oldham and Henry friends in holding a conventional Jericho on the 23d inst., and will meet then, and, in accordance with the established rule, for the purpose for the next State Senatorial seat be chosen from Oldham county.

2. That E. M. Garratt, M. T. Abbott, F. A. Adams, A. J. Bartlett, S. J. Guthrie, N. Parker, Wm. H. Gatewood, Wm. O. Vawter, J. B. Pierce, S. Gatewood, Wm. Samuel, J. W. Stewart, W. J. Wright, A. J. Wright, J. F. Butler, Wm. Tenney, Thos. M. Ellis, R. Bell, Thos. O'Brien, Wm. P. Ewing, J. D. Miles, Geo. Bell, Jacob Trout, Jas. Chowling, John Nicholson, Jas. Miller, W. R. Morgan, Wm. O. Ellis, J. H. Morgan, Peter Burton, A. S. Hoskins, Lindsey Carter, Ben. P. Canell, Geo. Miller, J. A. Marsley, Jas. Kelley and M. D. Abbott be appointed delegates to said Convention.

3. That we fully endorse the nomination of our bold champions of Democracy, Beriah Magalloway and Luan Boyd, and will use all honorable means in our power to secure them an increased Democratic majority in Little Trimble.

4. That the course pursued in Congress by our accomplished and talented representative, J. W. Stevenson, meets our hearty approval, and has reflected honor not only on his constituency, but on the honorable body of which he is a member; and, in view of this, he is, therefore, our first choice for re-nomination. And, although we have many able and worthy men who may aspire to the honor, yet, with all due deference to them, we say he is good enough for us.

5. That we hall with pride the nomination of the name of the Hon. James Guthrie for the first office in the gift of the people of this proud confederacy, and in his stern integrity, his spotless character and unswerving devotion, throughout his whole life, to the upholding and maintenance of Democratic principles, eminently qualifies him for that elevated and highly responsible office.

6. That we cannot let this occasion pass without endorsing the course of the Louisville Courier. Its staunch and fixed determination as a public journal to maintain and defending, boldly and fearlessly, Democratic principles, meets our hearty approval, and we hereby pledge ourselves to give it all the patronage in our power.

7. That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Louisville Courier, Louisville Democrat and Frankfort Yeoman. M. T. ABBOTT, Ch'n. M. M. FUSCRA, Sec.

### [For the Louisville Courier.]

### New Race Course Meeting.

At a meeting of stockholders in the National Race Course, held at the Galt House, on the 5th of April, Jno. B. Viley, Vice President, took the chair, and Samuel B. Thomas was appointed secretary. The committee on location, by Thos. H. Hunt, reported the purchase of Woodlawn, containing about 150 acres, of Geo. E. H. Gray, at the price of \$21,000.

On motion of R. A. Alexander, resolved,

1. That the action of the committee is hereby approved, and they are requested to have the property conveyed in trust, for the benefit of the subscribers, to Isaac Everett and R. A. Alexander, until such organization is made as will enable them legally to convey it to officers of the association.

2. That a call of one hundred dollars upon each share of stock, payable in cash, is hereby made.

3. That a further call of one hundred dollars payable in six, and one hundred dollars payable in twelve months is also made.

4. That the committee on location, acting in concert with the President and Vice President, are hereby authorized to lay out two tracks on this property; one for running and one for a trotting course; and also to have all needful stands, &c., &c., erected.

5. That a Committee on Rules, appointed at a previous meeting of the subscribers, are requested to suggest proper rules and regulations for the government of the Association in a future meeting.

6. That the President is requested to enter into a contract with the Louisville and Frankfort and Lexington Railroad Companies, in accordance with the terms suggested in the letter of W. A. Dudley to R. A. Adams.

7. That the President is authorized and requested to appoint an agent to collect the cash called on stock, and take notes for the balance at six and twelve months, payable to the order of Isaac Everett, President.

8. That it is inexpedient to have a racing meeting until next fall, and the time of the meeting shall be fixed and only announced by the President after consultation with the owners of racing stock.

9. That the President and Vice President are hereby authorized to employ a superintendent to take charge of the race course and improvements, and give him whatever compensation they may deem proper.

[Signed.] SAMUEL B. THOMAS, Sec'y.

### Democratic Meeting.

A meeting of the Democracy and such Old-Line Whigs of Fayette county as act with us, was held at the Court House, on yesterday, to appoint delegates to represent this county in the Democratic Convention to be held at Nicholasville on the 23d of May prox.

The resolutions endorsing the Congressional course of Hon. James B. Clay, and expressing a desire for his re-nomination by the District Convention, but echoes the voice of the Democracy of every county which has yet spoken on the subject. Bourbon, Nicholas, Franklin and Fayette have already called upon him to enter the field, while such is known to be the universal preference of the remaining counties, each of which have, in County Convention during the past winter, approved his record.—*Lex. States*, 12th.

"THE DROPPING FELL."—A terrible drop fell in that ocean of crime, the blood-stained city of Baltimore, yesterday, when four persons in the prime of their life suffered death on the gallows. Four lives suddenly cut off, and not for one, but four distinct crimes. The sun hardly ever shone upon a more mournful spectacle in any civilized community. Humanity stands aghast at it, and it may well be asked what the causes are of such a terrible state of things. Political arrogance and exclusiveness fed in Baltimore to lawlessness, brutality, and rude violence.

By violence citizens were deprived of their votes—by violence police officers were brought into office, and some of them, in their turns, became the victims of violence, and were murdered for endeavoring to check the unheard-of terrorism of the "Pug Uglies," and yesterday these murderers met an untimely death on the gallows, by retributive justice. Three of these wretched men asserted their innocence. What a horrible thought if the assertion be true in one single case only.

Yet, when anarchy threatens, and bloody deeds and violence have become the order of the day, how easily might not the general excitement extend over to the halls of justice, unconsciously influencing the mind and verdict of witnesses and of jurors. Every friend of humanity will hope with us, that with the fatal drop that fell yesterday in Baltimore may terminate the dark regime of lawlessness and rowdiness that has so long swayed its bloody scepter over that unfortunate city.—*Pennsylvanian*, 9th.